discovery, initial expert witness disclosures, rebuttal expert witness disclosures, expert discovery, and the motions filing deadline based on the following grounds:

(1) The parties previously requested and received a continuance of the fact discovery and expert discovery deadlines due to problems in scheduling key

26

27

2 3

1

witness depositions and the need for the State to resolve issues regarding the manner of producing Officer Flores' personnel files and the need for a protective order.

(2) Documents constituting the CHP Critical Incident Investigation Report have now been provided to Plaintiff's counsel, along with several policy manual documents. However, due to a heavily impacted schedule over the last two months (with multiple out of county depositions every week) in preparation for a trial that Defendants' counsel is now starting this week, Defendants' counsel has not yet been able to prepare the proposed stipulation for protective order that the parties hope will resolve the normal discovery dispute that occurs over demands for peace officer personnel files. In connection with this stipulation/protective order, Defendants' counsel also has to prepare what is called a non-relevancy log to identify the documents in Officer Flores' personnel file that contain highly private information (such as health and other insurance benefits, family member names, addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, etc.). The point of such a log is to advise Plaintiff's counsel of those particularly sensitive documents that Defendants believe are so private and not relevant to the action as to justify withholding them despite the use of a protective order for the other documents in the personnel file. The parties have met-and-conferred on this process and appear to be in general agreement on the process, subject to seeing the non-relevancy log and the proposed stipulation for protective order for all other personnel file documents. It is hoped that following this process will obviate the need for court intervention in motions to compel. The simple problem is that defense counsel's schedule has been so heavily impacted over the last several weeks that the timeconsuming work of preparing the necessary stipulation/protective order and screening of the personnel file for the non-relevancy log has not yet been completed. Defense counsel also faced substantial interruptions in office efficiency

due to the move of the entire Attorney General's Office during the month of May, which did not go smoothly.

3 4

(3) Also, because of good faith negotiations that took place between the parties in May and early June, the parties agreed to put off depositions.

6

5

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

28

- (4) The parties also need to conduct several depositions, some of which were delayed previously because of scheduling problems and others because of the need for Plaintiff's to have personnel file information. At a minimum, Plaintiffs want to take the depositions of the following officers: Sergio Flores, E.D. Colunga, Sergeant D. Kyle, and Sergeant Nicole Pacheco. However, it is anticipated that Plaintiffs are going to want to take the deposition of other officers involved in the incident and certain command officers. On the defense side, Defendants need to depose (at a minimum) Plaintiff, Chula Vista Fire Department Captain Albright, the two civilian witnesses who were on scene at the accident, the paramedics from American Medical Response, crew members from other San Diego Fire Department engines that responded to the scene, and crew members from Chula Vista Fire Department Engines on scene.
- (5) Defense counsel anticipates completing his trial by July 14, 2015. Defense counsel is in the process of preparing the proposed stipulation/protective order and non-relevancy log and anticipates being able to complete it within a week of finishing his current trial. Defense counsel also intends to have the personnel file documents ready for quick production to Plaintiffs under the terms of the protective order once it is signed.
- (6) The parties have designated expert witnesses, but the ability of the experts to prepare their reports is largely reliant on completion of the key witness depositions. It is now apparent that the July 20, 2015, initial expert disclosure deadline is no longer feasible for the parties.
- (7) In addition, the parties have met-and-conferred on the scope of a permissible psychiatric examination to be₃conducted on Plaintiff by Defendants'

1 psychiatry expert. The parties appear to have reached a consensus on the scope of 2 that exam. What remains is to find a date when this examination can be scheduled – most likely in August because of the parties' and the expert's schedules. 3 4 WHEREFORE: The parties stipulate to and jointly request the Court to change the 5 6 aforementioned deadlines to the following: 7 (1) The deadline to complete all discovery, other than expert witness discovery, be continued to September 11, 2015. 8 (2) The deadline for initial expert witness disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 9 26(a)(2) be continued to September 25, 2015. 10 (3) The deadline for rebuttal expert witness disclosures be continued to 11 October 23, 2015. 12 13 (4) The deadline to complete expert discovery be continued to November 24, 14 2015. 15 (5) The deadline for dispositive motions to be filed be continued to December 18, 2015. 16 17 (6) The Mandatory Settlement Conference remain as set on December 4, 18 2015. (7) The deadline for pretrial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(3) remain as set on 19 20 December 18, 2015. 21 (8) All other deadlines set in paragraphs 11 through 15 of the Court's original 22 Scheduling Order (Doc. 9) remain as set. 23 24 25 26 27 28

JOINT MOTION TO CONTINUE DISCOVERY AND MOTION FILING DEADLINES (14-cv-01749-GPC (DHB))

5

///

Case 3:14-cv-01749-GPC-RNB Document 13 Filed 07/07/15 PageID.79 Page 6 of 6